

REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 5-14 are now pending in the application, with claims 1 and 11-14 being independent claims. Claims 8 and 9 are withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 and 10-14 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure, including, for example, in Figures 1, 6, and 16, as well as at page 14, lines 9-24; page 15, lines 13-17; page 16, lines 2-7; and page 20, lines 17-21 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amendments do not include new matter.

Claims 11, 13, and 14 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the originally-filed disclosure does not describe ejection means, as was previously recited in the claims. In this regard, the Office Action also objects to the specification as not disclosing the ejection means.

Applicant respectfully traverse the Section 112 rejections and specification objection. The specification of the application discloses that the sensor or sensing apparatus may include an inkjet system for ejecting an object onto the waveguide. See p. 14, lines 9-13; p. 20, lines 17-19; p. 26, lines 9-12. Applicant submits that this disclosure provides support for the previously claimed ejection means. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claims 11, 13, and 14 so as to no longer recite the ejection means, but instead recite an inkjet system for ejecting and/or disposing

an object. Accordingly, Applicant submits that both the Section 112 rejections and specification objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 12, and 14 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagel et al. (“Integrated THz Technology for Label-free Genetic Diagnostics,” Applied Physics Letters, Vol. 81, No. 1 (2002)). Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stewing et al. (“A New Class of Improved-Efficiency THz Filters for On-Chip Detection of Biomaterials,” Microwave and Optical Technology Letters, Vol. 41, No. 2 (2004)). Claims 6, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagel et al. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewing et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejections and solely to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11-14 so as to clarify distinctions between the cited references and the invention. To this end, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 1 and 12 recite sensors that comprise, inter alia, a single conductor. Applicant submits that Nagel et al. and Stewing et al. do not disclose or suggest a sensor that includes a configuration with a single conductor. In Applicant’s view, Nagel et al. discloses a resonance structure formed of a waveguide that includes three microstrip lines. See, e.g., Nagel et al., Fig. 1 and its corresponding description. Stewing et al. appears to disclose a system that is configured in a manner similar to the system of Nagel et al. See, e.g., Stewing et

al., Figs. 1 and 2 and their corresponding description. Neither of these systems, however, is configured with “a single conductor,” as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 12.

Amended independent claims 11, 13, and 14 recite sensors and a sensing apparatus that comprise, inter alia, an ink jet system for ejecting and/or disposing an object. Applicant submits that neither Nagel et al. and Stewing et al. do not include an ink jet system in their disclosed devices. Moreover, neither Nagel et al. nor Stewing et al. appears to suggest the inclusion of an ink jet system within their respective systems.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the independent claims 1 and 11-14 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

The other claims are allowable by virtue of their dependency and in their own right by reciting further features of the invention. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are allowable over the references of record, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the application are earnestly solicited.

Any fee required in connection with this paper should be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in the Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DHH/tcl

FCHS_WS 2882263v1